

PATENT
Serial No. 10/020,055
Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on January 10, 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 10, 2006, which has been reviewed and carefully considered.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1, 3-4, 6 and 11-14 have been amended. Claims 1-22 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 6 and 11 being the only independent claims.

Reconsideration of the present application and entry of the present amendment are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claim 12 is objected to for a certain informality. In response, claim 12 has been amended to remove the informality as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claim 12 is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 6, and 19-22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. In addition, claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,067,583 (Gilbert) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,705 (Ruppel). Further, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Gilbert, in view of Ruppel and U.S. Patent No. 5,070,536 (Mahany).

PATENT

Serial No. 10/020,055

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on January 10, 2006

Claims 3-5, 8-9 and 14, 16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Gilbert, in view of Ruppel, Mahany and U.S. Patent No. 6,778,817 (Bullock). Claims 7, 10, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Gilbert, in view of Ruppel and Bullock. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Gilbert, in view of Ruppel and Mahany.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 6, and 19-22 contain allowable subject matter. By means of the present amendment, claim 6 has been amended to include certain features of base claim 1, without including features of the intervening claims as they are believed to be not necessary for patentability. Accordingly, allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Applicants have not rewritten claims 19-22 in independent form, since it is believed that independent claims 1 and 11, as well as claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-22 should be allowable over Gilbert, Ruppel, Mahany and Bullock for at least the following reasons.

In rejecting claim 3, on page 5 of the Final Office Action,

PATENT

Serial No. 10/020,055

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on January 10, 2006

the Examiner correctly noted that Gilbert, Ruppel and Mahany do not teach or suggest a booster station. Bullock is cited in an attempt to remedy this deficiency in Gilbert, Ruppel and Mahany.

Bullock is directed to a system for communicating signals without the need for continuous telephone lines. As correctly noted by the Examiner, Bullock shows in FIG 2 a booster 106 which has an antenna 107 for wireless communication. Further, as shown in FIG 4 and described on column 4, lines 38-40, the booster 106 is connected to power lines 105, where a base unit 104 is also connected thereto.

It is respectfully submitted that Bullock, as well as Gilbert, Ruppel, Mahany, and combinations thereof, do not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11 which, amongst other patentable elements, specifically requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

said base station including means for wireless communication with said remote unit and said at least one booster station.

Wireless communication between base and booster stations is nowhere taught or suggested in the cited section of Gilbert,

PATENT

Serial No. 10/020,055

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on January 10, 2006

Ruppel, Mahany Bullock, and combinations thereof.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 11 should be allowable. In additions, claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-22 should be allowable at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 11.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

It is believed that no additional fees or charges are currently due. However, in the event that any additional fees or charges are required for entrance of the accompanying amendment, they may be charged to Applicants' representatives Deposit Account No. 50-3649. In addition, please credit any overpayments related to any fees paid in connection with the accompanying amendment to Deposit Account No. 50-3649.


PATENT

Serial No. 10/020,055

Amendment in Reply to Final Office Action mailed on January 10, 2006

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 31, 2006

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101